NOTES

ON THE

COLLECTION OF ANCIENT MARBLES

IN THE

POSSESSION OF SIR CHARLES NICHOLSON, BART.

BY

CHARLES WALDSTEIN

REPRINTED FROM THE
JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES
1886

B. Michaelis

NOTES ON THE COLLECTION OF ANCIENT MARBLES

IN THE

POSSESSION OF SIR CHARLES NICHOLSON, BART.

[PLATES LXXI. AND C.]

I HAVE been asked to add a few notes on the collection of ancient monuments of which specimens are published on Plates LXXI. and C. These marbles were formerly in the possession of Mr. George McLeay, who, while residing in India, deposited them in the South Kensington Museum, where Professor Michaelis saw them. Most of them have already been described by Michaelis in his *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain* pp. 481 *seq.* Mr. McLeay had a house at Smyrna, and it was in Asia Minor, chiefly at Smyrna and in its neighbourhood, that he collected his antiquities. They have since been presented by him to Sir Charles Nicholson, who has placed them in his house, The Grange, Totteridge, Hertfordshire.

Most of these monuments belong to the Roman period of Greek art in Asia Minor. There can be no doubt that the interest attaching to such works will grow with the development and systematisation of the study of archaeology. For we may reasonably hope that, as our power to fix in time and to distinguish with accuracy the broader characteristic points of distinction between Greek and Graeco-Roman art grows, we shall not halt at this stage, but shall advance still further in successful endeavours to establish more detailed distinctions of time and even locality within these broader divisions.

Even at this moment it is possible to produce numbers of monuments of the Roman period, Roman in subject and in

treatment, which are known to come from different places, from Rome itself, from the South of Italy, from Greece Proper, or from Asia Minor. And the time may soon have arrived when (to take a definite instance) it may lead to instructive results to compare with conscientious exactness instances of the same Roman portrait statue as presented to us in the definite localities of Rome, Greece Proper, Asia Minor, &c., &c. Of course the question will then have to be considered and weighed, how far Greek artists worked for the foreign markets, whether they settled in the place where their goods were in demand, whether and how far Greek artists transplanted to foreign countries the hereditary name and craft. Their own idiosyncrasies might in the latter case be considerably modified by the customs, taste, and needs of the community in which they lived. Nay, when art became art-manufacture (as it did become to a certain degree in these later periods), the work might become modified by the characteristic demands of its place of destination, just as, in a far earlier period, it appears to me, the Cypriote works received their hybrid character from the action of such influences.

Such and similar questions will have to be considered; but even these questions will be more readily answered if such a careful grouping of monuments the origin of which is fully established is carried out, and they are subjected to accurate comparative study.

I. Plate LXXI, 1.—The first work is of great interest; it has not been exhibited at South Kensington, and has neither been described nor figured. The statue is of marble, and measures from knee to head 4 ft. 9½ in. There are wanting—both legs below the knee, both hands, and the point of the nose. A piece is also chipped out of the upper portion of the left arm. The head was detached from the neck, and has recently been fitted to the statue; but it undoubtedly belonged to the statue, as it not only is of the same marble and in a similar state of corrosion, but a continuous groove has been formed by running or trickling water on the top of the head, on the right side of the statue, which runs down the right side of the face, and continues at the neck and over the chest in an unbroken line. The whole surface of the statue has been much damaged by the wear of weather, especially the continuous dropping of water. This furrowing up of the surface is to be seen on all sides. There is

but one limited surface on the small of the back where the marble retains something of its original smoothness. Even the *nates* are thus affected on all sides. The water must thus have run over the statue on all sides, and it appears therefore to have stood unprotected in the open air. It is difficult to understand how the small receding portion in the back should have escaped; and this is not explained by assuming that it lay on its back. Two holes on the back near the left shoulder, one oblong and large, the other round and smaller, evidently served to fix it against some background, perhaps the *tympanon* of a pediment; and this would point to its being a pedimental figure. But it is impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion on this point, which presents fewer fixed data than the Aegina Marbles, concerning the corrosion of which such difference of opinion still exists.

The pose of the statue illustrates the type of Hermes as presented in the famous Hermes of Andros in the Patissia Museum (Athens), the Hermes in the Belvidere of the Vatican, and the Hermes from the Farnese Collection, now in the British Museum. A similar statue also exists at Munich.[1] As in all these statues so in ours, the youthful figure rests upon the right leg, and the right hip is thus thrust outwards. The right hand is pressed on the right hip. The head is slightly lowered and turned towards the right shoulder, which is also lowered. The figure is nude; but the chlamys is carried so that the one end hangs over the left shoulder and the breast, and, passing down the back, is wound round the left fore-arm, and then hangs to the ground. The figure probably held the caduceus in the left hand, as is the case in the Farnese replica.

Let us first consider the three well-known statues of Hermes to which ours corresponds fully: the Hermes of Andros, the Hermes of the Belvidere, and the Hermes Farnese. They no doubt all go back to an original prototype, the earliest of which we find in the famous Hermes carrying the infant Dionysos, by Praxiteles, discovered at Olympia. But there can be no doubt that the type has in them become considerably modified, both in the attributes and attitude, as well as in style. These three statues are later than Lysippus, and the head has undergone changes in the Lysippian direction. It

[1] Clarac, *Musée de Sculpture*, &c., vol. iv., Pl. 659, 1523.

has become shorter and rounder. The hair is not blocked out in the same way as in the Praxitelean statue, but has become more distinctly modelled in curved masses. Whereas in the Hermes of Praxiteles it is more specifically of the marble technical treatment, it has in these modified replicas, as it were, passed through the bronze technique, which is here reproduced in the marble, and this treatment characterises the heads of other statues ascribed to Lysippus, such as the Apoxyomenos and the Ares Ludovisi. This is more pronouncedly the case in the Farnese and Belvidere replicas than in the Hermes of Andros. They are nearer the immediate Lysippian type, represented by the Ares Ludovisi, than the head of the Hermes of Andros. The head from Andros has, in general, more of that expression of dreamy sentiment which we find in the Hermes of Praxiteles—the lips are closed; while in the other heads the general expression of dreaminess has given way to one of more decision, and the lips are parted, as in the Lysippian head of Ares. As regards the modelling of the body also, the Hermes of Andros is softer and less mechanical than in the other replicas. The latter are Roman in character, whereas the statue of Andros is more Greek in the working; it shows less of the very manifest mastery over, and reliance upon, the skilful use of tools which we perceive in even the most perfect specimens of works of Roman origin. As a slight but characteristic instance of this, I would but point to the circular incisions in the umbilical region, and at either breast. In the two Roman (especially the Belvidere) replicas, they are, as it were, drawn and incised as with compasses, perfectly and accurately round and unbroken. In the Hermes of Andros, and in the Praxitelean statue, this is not so to the same degree: we have more traces of hand-work, in a certain ungeometrical irregularity.

These peculiarities of the Greek statues, as far as the treatment of the body is concerned, are also to be found in our replica from Asia Minor. Only, in addition to these, we find a greater insistence upon a more realistic indication of the muscles, which points to a more conscious study of the living model and of the anatomy of the human figure. This can be best appreciated in examining the treatment of the right arm, where all the individual muscles are indicated, the

work being almost too much elaborated in detail. This looks as if all the replicas had passed through the influence of Lysippus, and as if this statue had, in addition, passed through that of the schools of Pergamon and Rhodes, and the stamp of these Asiatic schools had been impressed upon it.

Finally, the head of this statue differs from all the other heads in that it is much more individual, in fact, is iconic. The upper part of the face is comparatively much broader than the rest, the cheek-bones protruding, and this appearance is increased by the comparative sharpness of the chin. The mouth is small, the lower lip is very full and has a curious pouting thickness in the central portion. A further peculiarity is the treatment of the hair, which has, on the whole, been so much abraded that it can hardly be distinguished. But there remain clear indications of the fringe above the forehead, which resembles a succession of small points like the teeth of a dog or fox. This fringe we find in the head of the Hermes Logios, the so-called Germanicus, of the Louvre, which, according to the inscription, is the work of Kleomenes, the son of Kleomenes, who is probably[1] the same Kleomenes as the one mentioned by Pliny,[2] the sculptor of the statues of Thespiadae ordered by Pollio Asinius. I think it right to point to this similarity in the working of the hair; though I cannot at present see what relation our statue holds to this work of Kleomenes.

This statue thus appears to me to go back ultimately to the original type of the Hermes found in the famous work of Praxiteles at Olympia, which became in the course of time modified by Lysippian elements, and it is probably the work of an artist following those of that period of revival of Neo-Attic, Neo-Hellenic, or Hellenistic art which, according to Pliny[3] began to thrive in the 156th Olympiad (B.C. 156–3). But there are in it traces of elements which distinguish the chief schools of Asia Minor (Pergamon and Rhodes), so that we must assign it to a period of the growing Roman influence, but to the home in which the statue itself was found, namely, Asia Minor.

To clench what has been said, I would introduce a very important monument into this series of statues of Hermes. This

[1] Overbeck, *Gesch. d. Gr. Plast.*, ii. p. 379.

[2] *N.H.* xxxvi. 33.

[3] *N.H.* xxxiv. 51.

work has been discovered at Delos by the French excavators, and is described and published by M. Homolle.[1] The statue is that of a Roman, Caius Ofellius Ferus, in the form of Hermes, and no doubt (as other similar statues found on the same site show) had a portrait head of the Roman. The inscription on the base of this statue, published by M. Homolle, tells us that it is a work by Dionysios, the son of Timarchides, and Timarchides, the son of Polykles. It has been shown by M. Homolle (and this bears out the ingenious hypothesis of Brunn, made many years previous to the discovery of this statue and this inscription), that Timarchides and Dionysios, here mentioned, are cousins, and that Dionysios joined his father Timarchides and his uncle Polykles, who all three are reported by Pliny[2] as having been fellow-workers at the Porticus erected by Metellus in the year 146 B.C. Furthermore, one of these artists, Polykles, is mentioned by Pliny[3] with Timokles, who again is mentioned in passages by Pausanias[4] as being, together with Timarchides, the son of Polykles. In the passage of Pliny the artists are mentioned among those who signal a revival of art at Rome, where it languished before, in the 156th Olympiad, *i.e.* 156–3 B.C.; and Brunn has justly pointed to this particular date assigned by Pliny as the time when Metellus Macedonicus invited the Greek artists to Rome to decorate the Porticus. Moreover, M. Homolle shows that from inscriptions at Delos these works are fixed between the years 190—167 B.C., and that the date of this statue is probably nearer the year 167.

Overbeck has first pointed to the fact that this Hermes-Ofellius is a modified replica of the Hermes of Praxiteles. And when we study the whole series of these works it becomes in a most interesting manner evident that this statue is the link between the Praxitelean type of Hermes and the group of the other statues of Hermes mentioned above. The whole pose is much nearer to the Hermes of Praxiteles than are the other statues; and the right arm, which is lowered to the hip in the others, is here raised as in the Praxitelean work. But in this work from Delos we have the first step towards a modified arrangement of the chlamys in the direction of the Hermes of

[1] *Bulletin de Corresp. Hellen.* 1881, v. p. 390, pl. 12.

[2] *N.H.* xxxvi. 35.

[3] *Ib.* xxxiv. 51, 91.

[4] Paus. vi. 4, 5; 12, 9; x. 34, 6, 8.

Andros; the end, namely, hangs over the left shoulder, and it is partly wound round the fore-arm. But it retains more of the massing of the drapery as it hangs down by the fore-arm, and of the peculiar treatment of folds which characterises the remarkable drapery passing under the infant Dionysos, and hanging over the tree-stem, in the Praxitelean work. It is exactly the intermediary stage between the fourth century prototype and the later Roman modifications. Moreover, this work corresponds to our own statue from Asia Minor, in that it had a Roman portrait head added to the body of the Hermes. It is perhaps also well to remember that in connexion with this revival of Greek art at Rome about the year 145 B.C. we have mention of the custom of borrowing types from earlier Greek works, nay, of copying parts of such works. So Pausanias tells us that two of these very artists (Timokles and Timarchides) copied the shield of the Athene Parthenos by Pheidias in their statue of a warlike Athene at Elateia.[1] We thus have an interesting series:—First the Hermes with the infant Dionysos of Olympia by Praxiteles about the middle of the fourth century B.C. Then a work from about the year 167 B.C. by Dionysios and Timarchides, a Greek work of the early Roman period which marks the transition to still more modified types of the Roman period, one from Greece (Andros), another from Asia Minor, the others more Roman in character, found on the site of Rome, and probably the work of Greek artists there resident.

II. Plate LXXI, 2.—The next important work in this collection is that of a headless marble statue of a draped female figure, found in the same district. It appears to me that Michaelis, who describes the statue (No. 1 in his list) in the following terms, and who couples it with the figure immediately following it, has under-estimated its merits:—

Statue of a female, in long chiton, and over it the cloak, which covers the head and the whole body as far as below the knees. The treatment and fall of the folds resemble those in the terra-cotta figure, Clarac, v. 890 B, 2267 F, only the cloak is not thrown back over the l. shoulder, but covers the l. breast and thence falls down. The lowered l. arm is quite covered in the cloak, the upper part of the r. arm is likewise lowered, the fore-arm is missing, as is also the head. The figure rests on the r. leg, on the outside of the shin is a

[1] Paus. x. 34, 7.

square *puntello* which suggests an attribute (torch?) or some other accessory. H. abt. 1·70. Cf. the remark on no. 2.

To this description I should like to add, that the left hand, which is broken away, rested below the left breast, and that the point of a finger remains quite uninjured at a fold of the himation. The modelling of the drapery is unequal; somewhat coarse in the chiton as it covers the foot, but of great beauty in portions of the modelling of the outer garment. Throughout, the indication of texture, both in the drapery and in what remains of the nude about the neck, is of good work. The keen sense for texture, and the careful elaboration of the drapery in the outer garment, is manifested in a point of detail, in that the massing of folds in the under-garment, where it is drawn over the girdle, is indicated on the surface of the outer garment, on the side where this covers the chiton, by very delicate waves that can hardly be called folds. The whole composition of the figure, and the moderation in the treatment of the drapery, show a nobility which characterises Greek, in contradistinction to Roman, workmanship. This will be appreciated the more when this work is compared with the statues of Vestal virgins recently exhumed at Rome at the Temple of Vesta, to which our statue bears a strong resemblance (it was probably the statue of a priestess with the outer garment passing over the head). In comparison with these Graeco-Roman works, our statue is again more Hellenic in character, and thus stands nearer to a type of the fourth century Greek art from which all these works may have been derived, namely, the statue of Artemisia surmounting the mausoleum of Halicarnassus. Hence its relation to the earlier Greek prototype and the later Roman works would be similar to that just established with regard to the Hermes before described; its *provenance* also being the same. I hear that this work was found surmounting a Mahometan grave on the road between Sardis and Magnesia, nearer Sardis.

III. The other draped female figure is far inferior. Michaelis says of it:—

Statue of a female, in doubled chiton and over it a cloak, completely corresponding to four of the statues of the Loggia de' Lanzi in Florence (Cavalieri, *Antiq. stat. l. I. et II.* Pl. 81; cf. Clarac, iv. 767, 1894; v. 978 B, 2524 F). She rests on the r. leg. Missing:

head, r. arm, l. fore-arm with the folds of the drapery below it. H. abt. 1·70. Both the statues, nos. 1 and 2, stand on low irregularly shaped plinths. They are very slender in their proportions, slim in the upper part of the body, becoming broader below, with not quite common motives of drapery. Ordinary execution. They are exact counterparts of the statues at Oxford, nos. 1—9 (cf. Oxford, after no. 9).

Since Michaelis saw the statue, a head which belonged to the collection has been added. This head does certainly not belong to the statue, and ought to be removed. It is an interesting head, though the hair is inferior, modelled in "corded" ridges. The face, especially the modelling about the eyes, is of great softness, and reminds us of the Aphrodite of Melos. The statue itself is, it appears to me, of a later date than the preceding one, more Roman in character, and, as has been said, in every way inferior.

FIG. 1.

IV. Fig. 1.—The fragment of a sepulchral relief, described by Michaelis as No. 16, is not of marble, but of terra-cotta. He says of it :—

Fragment of a sepulchral relief, broken both at top and bottom. On the l. stands a youth, full face, almost nude, holding the chlamys on the r. shoulder with r. hand, the l. lowered. Beside him a nude

boy, who turns up his face and r. hand to him; in the lowered l. hand he holds the strigil (στλεγγίς) and the alabastron. Lively execution. H. 0·32. L. 0·30. From Smyrna.

This interesting terra-cotta relief must be compared with the unfinished Greek relief of the fourth century found at the Dipylon at Athens, and now in the Patissia Museum; it is described and figured by M. Pottier.[1] The Athenian relief represents a victorious athlete standing nude, and with his upraised right hand placing the victor's wreath on his brow, while in his left hand he holds a palm-branch. The similarity in the type of the body and in the attitude is so striking that it is hard not to believe in a more or less immediate dependence.

V. Plate C, 1.—*Relief.* On a field surrounded by a frame there sits enthroned in the middle, *Zeus*, turned l., his legs covered by his cloak, the l. hand high up on the sceptre, the r., perhaps with a cup, on the thigh. To the l. before him stands, very nearly in full face, a noble *female figure* in chiton and cloak, with a long sceptre on her r. arm, the l. hand lowered; a high ornament on the head (modius?) may designate her as Hera or Demeter, or again as the tutelary goddess of a town. Behind the throne of Zeus stands *Anubis*, with the head of a dog, draped in a chlamys. Very coarse and much abraded. Below the relief a large empty space. H. 0·65. L. 0·36. From Erythrae.

To this description I should merely like to add that the ornament on the head of the female figure seems a *modius*, but has also the appearance of horns; still it seems to represent a deity of a town, and this will be confirmed when we compare it with the relief from the base of a statue of Tiberius found at Puteoli (Puzzuoli) in 1840, which contains in *alto relievo* fourteen figures of towns of Asia Minor with their respective names inscribed below them,[2] of the figures of Sardis, Magnesia, Philadelphia, Kyme, Myrina, Apolloneia, and Aegae, have ornaments on their heads corresponding to the traces on the head of the figure in question.

Concerning the other works in this collection we can but repeat the remarks of Michaelis in his own words:—

Group of Ganymedes and the eagle. The youth, nude except for a Phrygian cap and boots, stands with l. knee bent by a pillar which is partly covered by his chlamys; the outstretched l. arm lies on the

[1] *Bullet. d. Corresp. Hellen.* v. p. 65, pl. 3.

[2] Overbeck, *Gesch. d. Gr. Pl.* ii. p. 435.

pillar; of the lowered r. arm with the pedum only remnants are preserved. Ganymedes looks up at the eagle, which sits above his l. arm on the pillar (cf. *Monum. dell' Inst.*, 1856, Pl. 18). The pose of Ganymedes is somewhat stiff and affected. The whole group is backed with a pillar, and was therefore most probably meant for architectural decoration (cf. Cambridge, no. 4, Wilton, no. 144); the moderate execution falls in with this view. H. 0·76.

Statue of Pan. The god stands by a tree on which hangs the syrinx. A leather apron full of fruit hangs slantwise from the r. shoulder; in the l. arm he holds a pruning-knife (blade missing). These attributes remind one of Silvanus. Head of unpleasantly brutish expression. Goat's legs. Lowered r. arm and part of l. leg below the knee missing. Late, ordinary Roman work. H. 1·01.

Eight heads, of bad, late workmanship, and rather damaged; from Smyrna, Rhodes, &c. The following may be particularly mentioned: a head over life-size, perhaps of *Zeus*, though of a gloomy aspect, which suggests Pluto rather than Zeus; a head of *Herakles* with curly hair and beard; a pretty good *female head.*

Plate C, 2.—*Votive relief*, flanked by two antae which carry an entablature furnished with roofing tiles. On the l. stands a youth in chlamys beside a horse; before him, in about the middle of the relief, stands a female figure, in chiton, the l. arm and the lower part of the body enveloped in cloak, offering the youth a cup. Both figures are on a much larger scale than those at the r. end of the scene: a male and two female figures, and in the foreground three children (apparently two boys and a girl). These six persons approach in adoration; before them a boy, quite small, leads a ram to the altar which stands between the two principal personages. The relief is moderately low and reminds us of Attic reliefs. H. 0·41. L. 0·56. From Smyrna.

Sepulchral stone of Sandioklos, broken into two fragments. On the r. sits a female figure completely veiled (head missing). In the background a tree, entwined by a snake. To the l. stands in full face the deceased, a bearded man, in cloak, the l. hand lowered, the r. before the breast; for his somewhat self-conscious attitude cf. Oxford, no. 89. By him a diminutive attendant, with crossed legs, the head supported on the l. hand. Below, the inscription, in characters indicating the Roman period: χαῖρε Σανδίοκλε. (For the name cf. Σανδίων, the Σάνδιος λόφος near Myus, Thuk. 3, 19, Σανδώκης of Kymè, Her. 7, 194.) Rather high relief. H. abt. 0·60. L. 0·44.

Relief in a frame. A man in a very short chiton and with boots, flourishing a whip in his r. hand and holding out a cloth in his l., advances against a tiger which springs at him from the r. Coarse stone. H. 0·51. L. 0·66. From the amphitheatre at Pergamon.

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.